



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/306,189	05/06/1999	MICHAEL RICHARD COOPER	AT9-98-920	3131

7590

06/20/2002

DUKE W YEE  
CARSTENS YEE & CAHOON LLP  
PO BOX 802334  
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

ROMERO, ALMARI C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/306,189

Applicant(s)

COOPER ET AL.

Examiner

Almari Romero

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 October 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 5/06/99 and Preliminary Amendment filed on 10/13/99.
2. Claims 1-26 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25, and 26 are independent claims.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 6/21/99 have been considered.

#### ***Drawings***

4. The formal drawings were received on 10/18/99 and were approved by the Draftsman.

#### ***Specification***

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 1, "Related Inventions" section of the specification, Applicant is reminded to insert related applications serial numbers and the status of each application, if allowed or in patent prosecution.

Appropriate correction is required.

6. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. For example on page 12, line 31 – page 13, line 1 "http://www.w3.org". Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. **Claims 6-11, 17-22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Meltzer et al. (USPN 6,226,675 B1 – filing date: 10/16/1998).**

**Regarding independent claims 6, 17, and 25, Meltzer discloses:**

A method, data processing system, and computer program product on a computer readable medium for generating a markup language file, comprising:

executing an application program (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 17-60: teaches JAVA (application program));

parsing a document type definition file for a markup language (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 38-60: teaches parsing XML DTD);

selecting an element defined in the document type definition file based on a routine called by the application program (Meltzer on col.23, lines 38-60: teaches element retrieved from XML DTD and col. 23, lines 17-60: teaches JAVA (application program)); and

writing the selected element to a markup language file (Meltzer on col.23, lines 38-60: teaches producing an output by received XML element).

**Regarding dependent claims 7 and 18, Meltzer discloses:**

wherein the element comprises an attribute list corresponding to parameters for the routine (Meltzer on col.76, lines 33-67: teaches elements and attributes).

**Regarding dependent claims 8 and 19, Meltzer discloses:**

wherein the selected element written to the markup language file comprises an attribute list corresponding to values for the parameters passed to the routine (Meltzer on col.76, lines 33-67: teaches attributes values).

**Regarding dependent claims 9 and 20, Meltzer discloses:**

wherein the application program is written in Java programming language (Meltzer on col. 5, lines 1-19: teaches JAVA).

**Regarding dependent claims 10 and 21, Meltzer discloses:**

wherein the routine is an extended class method (Meltzer on col.76, lines 33-67: teaches JAVA classes, methods).

**Regarding dependent claims 11 and 22, Meltzer discloses:**

wherein the routine is a Graphics class method (Meltzer on col. 76, lines 33-67: teaches JAVA classes, methods).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 1-5, 12-16, 23-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer et al. (USPN 6,226,675 B1 – filing date: 10/16/1998) in view of Day et al. (USPN 5,953,526 – filing date 11/10/1997).**

**Regarding independent claims 1, 12, and 23, Meltzer discloses:**

A method, data processing system, and a computer program product in a computer readable medium for processing a source code statement written in a programming language (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 38-60: teaches JAVA object), comprising:

parsing a document type definition file for a markup language (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 38-60: teaches parsing document type of XML format);

selecting an element defined in the document type definition file (Meltzer on col. 3, lines 28-45: teaches data typing of elements within XML document type definition DTD) based on an association between the element and an identifier of a routine in the source code statement (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 38-60: teaches selected JAVA objects to proceed with the translation into XML).

writing the selected element to a markup language file (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 38-60: teaches elements of a document produces output and output is translated to the format of an output document).

Meltzer does not explicitly disclose, “parsing a source code statement from a source code file”. However, Day on col. 7, lines 24-50 and col. 8, lines 12-45: teaches parsing JAVA file to look for package statement.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Day into Meltzer to provide a way for parsing a statement from a JAVA file to be associated with the element from the document type definition in order to enhance the displayable output of the document.

**Regarding dependent claims 2 and 13,** Meltzer discloses:

wherein the source code statement comprises parameters for the routine and wherein the element comprises an attribute list corresponding to the parameters (Meltzer on col. 76, lines 33-67: teaches associating JAVA Bean with the elements and attributes from the DTD).

**Regarding dependent claims 3 and 14,** Meltzer discloses:

wherein the selected element written to the markup language file comprises an attribute list of values for the parameters passed to the routine (Meltzer on col.76, lines 33-67: teaches attributes values from XML DTD).

**Regarding dependent claims 4 and 15,** Meltzer discloses:

wherein the routine is a procedure, subroutine, function, method, class, or software object (Meltzer on col.76, lines 33-67: teaches JAVA Bean (JAVA classes, method)).

**Regarding independent claims 5, 16, and 24,** Meltzer discloses:

A method, data processing system, and computer program product on a computer readable medium for processing a markup language element, comprising:

parsing a document type definition file for the markup language (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 38-60: teaches parsing document type of XML format);

parsing a markup language element from a markup language file (Meltzer on col.23, lines 38-60: teaches parsing elements and attributes from XML);

selecting an element defined in the document type definition file that is equivalent to the markup language element from the markup language file (Meltzer on col.23, lines 38-60: teaches elements (selected) and attributes from XML DTD to be translated from the form of a JAVA object);

generating a source code statement using an identifier of a routine within the selected element (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 38-60: teaches selected JAVA objects to proceed with the translation into XML).

Meltzer does not explicitly disclose, "writing the source code statement to an output file". However, Day on col. 8, lines 2-45: teaches JAVA Doc combined into the HTML for display.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Day into Meltzer to provide a way for displaying a JAVA Doc (source code statement) by combining the JAVA Doc into HTML in order enhance the displayable output of the document.

**Regarding independent claim 26, Meltzer discloses:**

A method of processing a source code statement written in a programming language, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

parsing a grammar input file for a markup language (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 38-60: teaches parsing DTD of XML format);

selecting a language syntax construct defined in the grammar input file base on an association between the language syntax construct and an identifier of a routine in the source code statement (Meltzer on col.10, liens 29-45 and col. 79, lines 34-62: teaches XML syntax translation into JAVA Bean); and

writing the selected language syntax construct to a markup language file (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 38-60: teaches elements of a document produces output and output is translated to the format of an output document and col. 79, lines 34-62: teaches XML syntax).

Meltzer does not explicitly disclose, “parsing a source code statement from a source code file”. However, Day on col. 7, lines 24-50 and col. 8, lines 12-45: teaches parsing JAVA file to look for package statement.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Day into Meltzer to provide a way for parsing a statement from a JAVA file to be associated with the element from the document type definition in order to enhance the displayable output of the document.

### ***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

USPN 6,028,605 – Conrad et al.

USPN 6,377,956 B1 – Hsu et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Almari Romero whose telephone number is (703) 305-5945. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Thursdays (7:30am - 6:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

AR  
June 16, 2002

  
**HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**